1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) No. CR 04-
11	Plaintiff,)
12	V.))
13	THOMAS A. SEBASTIAN,	[18 U.S.C. § 371: Conspiracy
14	Defendant.	to Commit Securities Fraud]
15		
16	The United States Attorney charges:	
17	COUNT ONE	
18	[18 U.S.C. § 371]	
19	I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>	
20	1. At all times relevant to this information:	
21	a. L90, Inc. ("L90") was a Delaware corporation	
22	headquartered and with its main operations in Santa Monica and	
23	Marina del Rey, California.	
24	b. Defendant THOMAS A. SEBASTIAN ("SEBASTIAN") was	
25	L90's Chief Financial Officer.	
26	c. Co-conspirator John C. Bohan ("Bohan") was a	
27	founder of L90, a member of L90's Board of Directors, and L90's	
28	President and Chief Executive Officer.	
	DAA:daa	

- d. Co-conspirator Mark D. Roah ("Roah") was a founder of L90, a member of L90's Board of Directors, and L90's Senior Vice President -- Business Development.
- e Co-conspirator Lucrezia Bickerton ("Bickerton") was an employee in and a consultant to L90's finance department from the time of L90's incorporation through on or about February 1, 2002. At various times, Bickerton held the titles Director of Finance, Controller, and Vice President -- Finance at L90.

L90's Business

- 2. L90's primary business was internet advertising representation and sales. L90 would act as a sales representative for a website's advertising space (such as space on the website available for banner ads) and collected consumer marketing information (such as electronic mail address lists). A website for which L90 served as an advertising sales representative was called an L90 "website partner." L90 would sell the advertising inventory of its website partners, retaining a portion of the sales price as profit.
- 3. In July 2000, L90 acquired a company called Webmillion.com ("Webmillion") as a wholly-owned subsidiary. Webmillion was an internet gaming website. Individual users could register with Webmillion by providing personal information requested by Webmillion. Once registered, the individual users could play lottery-type and other games on Webmillion, with a chance to win cash and other valuable prizes. Webmillion sold advertising space on its website, and also sold the registration information gathered from the Webmillion users to advertisers.

Federal Financial Reporting and Record Keeping Requirements

- 4. L90's common stock was registered with the United States Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") and was traded on the national market of the National Association of Securities Dealers' Automated Quotation System ("NASDAQ"). L90 had shareholders located throughout the United States, including in the Central District of California.
- 5. As a public company, L90 was required to comply with the rules and regulations of the SEC. Those rules and regulations are designed to protect members of the investing public by, among other things, ensuring that a company's financial information is accurately recorded and disclosed to the public.
- duty to, among other things: (a) make and keep books, records and accounts which, in reasonable detail, fairly and accurately reflected the company's business transactions; (b) devise and maintain a system of internal accounting controls sufficient to provide reasonable assurances that the company's transactions were recorded as necessary to permit preparation of financial statements in conformity with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles ("GAAP"); and (c) file with the SEC quarterly reports (on Form 10-Q) and annual reports (on Form 10-K) containing information about the company's management, board of directors, and business operations, as well as financial statements that accurately presented its financial condition and results of its business operations in accordance with GAAP.

28 / / /

7. L90's financial results were publicly reported four times a year, that is quarterly, based on a fiscal year that began January 1. Accordingly, L90's first fiscal quarter began January 1 and ended March 31; its second fiscal quarter began April 1 and ended June 30; its third fiscal quarter began July 1 and ended September 30; and its fourth fiscal quarter began October 1 and ended December 31.

8. L90's annual financial statements were required to be audited by an independent public accountant. L90's independent public accountant was Arthur Andersen LLP ("Arthur Andersen").

The "Bartering" of Internet Advertising

- 9. When a website on the internet had advertising inventory that it was unable to sell, it was common for such a website to "barter" that advertising inventory with another website, i.e. to trade its own unsold advertising inventory for unsold advertising inventory on the other website. In such a manner, a website could obtain internet advertising for itself without having to pay cash for such advertising.
- 10. From time to time, L90 would acquire advertising inventory from its website partners. Beginning in or about April 1999, co-conspirators Bohan and Bickerton, and other persons, caused L90 to seek advice from Arthur Andersen as to whether L90, if it bartered such advertising inventory for other advertising inventory, could record the "value" of the bartered inventory as revenue. In or about September 1999, defendant SEBASTIAN, co-conspirators Bohan and Bickerton, and other persons, learned from Arthur Andersen that such barter transactions could be recorded as revenue only if several requirements were met, and that any

recorded revenue would have to be disclosed as having been derived from barter transactions. Among the requirements on recording revenue from barter transactions was that L90 obtain an independent appraisal of the fair value of the bartered inventory. In or about October 1999, defendant SEBASTIAN caused L90 to communicate to Arthur Andersen that L90 considered the various requirements on recording revenue from barter transactions to be prohibitive, and that L90 therefore would not record advertising barter transactions as revenue.

11. On or about March 16, 2000, the Emerging Issues Task
Force ("EITF") of the Financial Accounting Standards Board
("FASB") issued EITF Issue No. 99-17, entitled "Accounting for
Advertising Barter Transactions," which described requirements
for recognizing revenue from advertising barter transactions.
Among those requirements was that the fair value of the bartered
advertising be objectively assessed, and that the revenue be
disclosed in the bartering company's financial statements as
revenue from an advertising barter transaction.

Overview of the Scheme to Defraud

- 12. Defendant SEBASTIAN would cause L90 periodically to announce to the investing public L90's projected future revenue and other financial data. Outside analysts that covered L90 (hereinafter "Wall Street analysts") also would project estimated future L90 revenue and other financial data, and would announce their projections to the investing public.
- 13. Beginning in or about July 2000, co-conspirator Bohan and other L90 executives became worried that L90's revenue for the third quarter 2000 would fall short of projected revenue

estimates for that quarter. In order to ensure that L90's reported revenue met or exceeded projections for the third quarter 2000 and for subsequent quarters, defendant SEBASTIAN, co-conspirators Bohan, Roah, and Bickerton, and others persons embarked upon a series of artifices designed to inflate L90's reported revenues to make them appear higher than they really were.

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- Among the ways by which defendant SEBASTIAN, coconspirators Bohan, Roah, and Bickerton, and other persons artificially inflated L90's revenue results was through advertising barter transactions and corresponding "check swaps" involving L90's subsidiary Webmillion. As described below, Bohan, Roah, and other persons caused Webmillion to enter into advertising barter transactions with other internet advertisers. Bohan, Roah, Bickerton, and other persons then caused L90 and those internet advertisers to exchange checks or wire transfers in amounts representing the "value" assigned to the bartered advertising. SEBASTIAN, Bohan, Bickerton, and other persons then caused L90 to record the assigned "value" of the bartered advertising as revenue, without disclosing that such revenue resulted from barter transactions. SEBASTIAN, Bohan, and other persons then knowingly made and caused to be made false and misleading statements and/or material omissions about L90's financial performance in L90's SEC filings, in press releases, and during conference calls with Wall Street analysts.
- 15. This scheme to defraud caused L90 materially to overstate its quarterly revenue results for the third and fourth quarters of 2000, and for the first and second quarters of 2001.

- Without the advertising barter revenue fraudulently included in L90's quarterly financial results, L90 would have failed to meet projected revenue estimates in the fourth quarter of 2000 and in the first quarter of 2001. Specifically:
- a. In the fourth quarter of 2000, L90's reported revenue of \$18.3 million, which narrowly surpassed analyst expectations of approximately \$18.2 million, contained more than \$735,000 in fraudulently-recognized barter revenue.
- b. In the first quarter of 2001, L90's reported revenue of \$10.6 million, which narrowly surpassed analyst expectations of approximately \$10.5 million, contained more than \$2.1 million in fraudulently-recognized barter revenue.

II. THE OBJECTS OF THE CONSPIRACY

- 16. From in or about July 2000, and continuing through in or about February 2002, within the Central District of California and elsewhere, defendant SEBASTIAN, co-conspirators Bohan, Roah, and Bickerton, and other persons knowingly and unlawfully combined, conspired, and agreed to commit the following offenses against the United States:
- a. to employ a device, scheme and artifice to defraud in connection with the purchase and sale of L90 securities, using the means and instrumentalities of interstate commerce, in violation of Title 15, United States Code, Sections 78j(b) and 78ff, and Title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 240.10b-5;
- b. to make untrue, false, and misleading statements of material fact in reports and documents required to be filed under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and the rules and

- regulations thereunder, in violation of Title 15, United States Code, Sections 78m(a) and 78ff, and Title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, Sections 240.12b-20, 240.13a-1, and 240.13a-13; and
- c. to knowingly make and cause to be made materially false and misleading statements to Arthur Andersen in connection with its review of L90's financial statements and the preparation of reports required to be filed with the SEC, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 78ff, and Title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 240.13b2-2.

III. THE MANNER AND MEANS OF THE CONSPIRACY

- 17. The objects of the conspiracy were carried out by the following means, among others:
- a. From the third quarter 2000, through and including the second quarter 2001, co-conspirators Bohan and Roah and other persons caused L90's subsidiary Webmillion to enter into advertising barter transactions with other internet advertisers whereby an internet advertiser would purchase advertising from Webmillion, and in exchange Webmillion would purchase a similar dollar amount of advertising from the internet advertiser. Typically, the dollar amounts assigned to the advertising bought and sold pursuant to these transactions were inflated, and did not represent the fair value of the advertising.
- b. In connection with each of these barter transactions, co-conspirators Bohan, Roah, Bickerton, and other persons caused L90 and the internet advertiser that was a party to the barter transaction to engage in a "check swap," that is, an exchange of checks or wire transfers for similar dollar

amounts that corresponded to the purported value of the advertising exchanged. Frequently, a third-party intermediary would be inserted into the check swap, the purpose of which was to disguise the true nature of the transaction in order to make it appear as though the buyer of advertising from Webmillion and the seller of advertising to Webmillion were different entities, when in fact they were the same.

- c. Within L90, these transactions were referred to as "Mark Roah," "MR," "Co-Marketing," or "CM" deals, so as to disguise the fact that they were in fact barter transactions.
- d. The amount paid by L90 less the amount received by L90 pursuant to these barter and check swap agreements netted, in essence, to zero. According to GAAP, the amounts received through these barter and check swap agreements could not be recognized as revenue and, to the extent these amounts were included in L90's financial statements, they had to be disclosed as having been derived from barter transactions.
- e. It was part of the conspiracy that defendant SEBASTIAN, co-conspirators Bohan and Bickerton, and other persons regularly met and spoke in person and by telephone, and corresponded by electronic mail messages during the relevant time period to discuss, among other things, the status of revenue for the quarter, and to compare L90's likely quarterly revenues with Wall Street analysts' projected revenues and other targets. If it appeared that L90 would fall short of these projections, Bohan, Roah, and other persons would cause Webmillion to enter into barter agreements with internet advertisers, and cause L90 and those internet advertisers to enter into corresponding "check

swaps" in a total amount sufficient to cover any shortfall.

- f. Defendant SEBASTIAN, co-conspirators Bohan and Bickerton, and other persons would cause L90 fraudulently to recognize revenue from these advertising barter transactions in the amount necessary to make it appear that the quarterly targets had been met.
- g. Defendant SEBASTIAN, co-conspirator Bickerton, and other persons would knowingly cause false statements and/or material omissions to be made to Arthur Andersen to make it appear as though the fraudulently-recorded barter transactions were in fact legitimately-recorded advertising sales.
- h. Defendant SEBASTIAN, co-conspirators Bohan and Bickerton, and other persons would knowingly cause materially false and misleading financial statements to be made on Forms 10-Q and 10-K with the SEC.
- i. Defendant SEBASTIAN, co-conspirators Bohan and Bickerton, and other persons would knowingly cause materially false and misleading statements about L90's financial performance to be made in press releases.
- j. Defendant SEBASTIAN and co-conspirator Bohan would tout L90's fraudulent revenue numbers during conference calls with Wall Street analysts.
- 18. The fraudulent recognition of revenue from the transactions described above, and the fraudulent reporting that L90 had met or exceeded projected quarterly and annual revenue results when, in truth, L90's financial results were materially overstated and L90 had not met projected revenue results, had a material impact on the share price of L90.

IV. OVERT ACTS

19. In furtherance of the conspiracy and in order to accomplish its objects, defendant SEBASTIAN, co-conspirators Bohan, Roah, and Bickerton, and other persons committed and caused to be committed the following overt acts, among others, within the Central District of California and elsewhere:

OVERT ACT NO. 1: On or about August 15, 2000, Bickerton sent an electronic mail message to defendant SEBASTIAN and another person in which she stated that she had been working with Roah on Webmillion barter deals.

OVERT ACT NO. 2: On or about November 27, 2000, Bickerton sent an electronic mail message to defendant SEBASTIAN, Bohan, Roah, and other persons in which she stated that L90 had \$1.8 million in "Mark Roah - webMillion" deals available to be recorded in the fourth quarter of 2000.

OVERT ACT NO. 3: On or about December 29, 2000, defendant SEBASTIAN, Bohan, Bickerton, and other persons received an electronic mail message, to which was attached a spreadsheet that identified the dollar amount of "Mark Roah" deals that was available to be recorded in the fourth quarter of 2000.

OVERT ACT NO. 4: In or about December 2000, defendant SEBASTIAN, Bohan, Bickerton, and other persons caused L90 improperly to recognize in the fourth quarter of 2000 over \$735,000 in revenue from advertising barter transactions, in violation of GAAP.

OVERT ACT NO. 5: On or about February 9, 2001, defendant SEBASTIAN, Bohan, Bickerton, and another person signed a "management representation letter" to Arthur Andersen in

connection with its audit of L90's fiscal year 2000 financial statements. The letter included the following materially false representations:

- (i) "The financial statements referred to above [for the year ended December 31, 2000] are fairly presented in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States."
- (ii) "There are no material transactions that have not been properly recorded in the accounting records underlying the financial statements."
- (iii) "There has been no . . . [f] raud involving management or employees who have significant roles in internal control."

OVERT ACT NO. 6: On or about February 15, 2001, defendant SEBASTIAN, Bohan, Bickerton, and other persons caused L90 to issue a press release announcing financial results for the fourth quarter 2000. The announcement was materially false in that, among other things, it reported that revenues for the quarter were \$18.3 million. In fact, revenues were materially overstated by in excess of \$735,000.

OVERT ACT NO. 7: On or about February 15, 2001, defendant SEBASTIAN told Wall Street analysts and other persons on an earnings release conference call that L90's revenues for the fourth quarter 2000 were \$18.3 million, and that L90 had met analysts' projected revenue expectations of \$18.3 million. These statements were materially false and misleading in that, among other things, revenues were materially overstated by \$735,000 of fraudulently-recorded barter revenue, and without such revenue L90 had failed to meet analysts' projections.

OVERT ACT NO. 8: On or about March 26, 2001, defendant SEBASTIAN, Bohan, Bickerton, and other persons received an electronic mail message in which was identified several hundred

thousand dollars of "Roah deals" that had been and were being recorded as revenue at the end of the first quarter 2001.

OVERT ACT NO. 9: On or about March 30, 2001, defendant SEBASTIAN, Bohan, Bickerton, and other persons caused L90 to file a report with the SEC on Form 10-K, reporting its financial results for the year 2000 and for the fourth quarter 2000. The reported results were materially false and misleading in that they included improperly recorded revenue, failed to disclose that more than \$735,000 of the reported revenue for the fourth quarter 2000 resulted from barter transactions, and failed to disclose that management was engaged in and directing others to engage in fraudulent accounting practices.

OVERT ACT NO. 10: In or about March 2001, defendant SEBASTIAN, Bohan, Bickerton, and other persons caused L90 improperly to recognize in the first quarter of 2001 over \$2.1 million in revenue from advertising barter transactions, in violation of GAAP.

OVERT ACT NO. 11: On or about April 26, 2001, defendant SEBASTIAN, Bohan, Bickerton, and other persons caused L90 to issue a press release announcing financial results for the first quarter 2001. The announcement was materially false in that, among other things, it reported that revenues for the quarter were \$10.6 million and were "in line with analyst expectations." In fact, revenues were materially overstated by in excess of \$2.1 million.

OVERT ACT NO. 12: On or about April 26, 2001, defendant SEBASTIAN told Wall Street analysts and other persons on an earnings release conference call that L90's revenues were \$10.6

million, and that L90 had met analysts' projected revenue expectations of \$10.55 million. These statements were materially false and misleading in that, among other things, revenues were materially overstated by \$2.1 million in fraudulently-recorded barter revenue, and without such revenue L90 had failed to meet analysts' projections.

OVERT ACT NO. 13: On or about May 10, 2001, defendant SEBASTIAN, Bohan, Bickerton, and other persons caused L90 to file a report with the SEC on Form 10-Q, reporting its financial results for the first quarter 2001. The reported results were materially false and misleading in that they included improperly recorded revenue, failed to disclose that more than \$2.1 million of the reported revenue for the first quarter 2001 resulted from barter transactions, and failed to disclose that management was engaged in and directing others to engage in fraudulent accounting practices.

OVERT ACT NO. 14: On or about January 3, 2002, defendant SEBASTIAN, Bohan, and other persons caused L90 to file a report with the SEC on Form 8-K, which announced that L90 and eUniverse had agreed to merge; attached a copy of a press release announcing that L90 stockholders would receive between \$2 and \$2.20 per share in connection with the merger; and attached a copy of the merger agreement between L90 and eUniverse. The merger agreement attached to the Form 8-K, which had been signed by Bohan on or about January 2, 2002, contained the following materially false and misleading representations and warranties:

(a) all of L90's reports that previously had been filed with the SEC were free from any materially misleading statement or

omission; (b) all of L90's financial statements contained in its previous SEC filings had been prepared in accordance with GAAP and had fairly presented the true financial condition of L90; and (c) L90 had complied with all laws applicable to the conduct of its business. DEBRA W. YANG United States Attorney STEVEN D. CLYMER Special Assistant U.S. Attorney Chief, Criminal Division GREGORY J. WEINGART Assistant United States Attorney Chief, Major Frauds Section DOUGLAS A. AXEL Assistant United States Attorney Major Frauds Section 2.1